



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/988,342	11/19/2001	Hiroomi Matsuzaki	684.3286	8519
5514	7590-1	08/06/2003		
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			EXAMINER	
			BEATTY, ROBERT B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2852	
DATE MAILED: 08/06/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Response to Rule 312 Communication	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/988,342	MATSUZAKI, HIROOMI	
	Examiner Robert Beatty	Art Unit 2852	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. The amendment filed on 6/17/03 & 7/22/03 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

- a) entered.
- b) entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.
- c) disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.
Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.
- d) disapproved. See explanation below.
- e) entered in part. See explanation below.

The applicant sent in a 312 amendment on 6/17/2003 which made corrections to claims 16,17 and 19. This amendment was approved for entry and a communication was mailed 8/6/2003 notifying the applicant.

The applicant sent in a duplicate of the previous 312 amendment on 7/22/2003 and this communication will re-affirm the entry of the amendment to claims 16,17 and 19.

The applicant has sent another 312 amendment on 7/22/2003 asking to correct informalities to Fig.s 10,11,20,21,22, and 27. This amendment is approved for entry.

The applicant has also sent in a Marked-Up Version of Substitute Specification and amendments to the claims which have numerous changes. This substitute specification and claim changes has not been mentioned in any of the applicant's amendments. Therefore it is unclear whether applicant intended to include this with the 312 amendment of 7/22/03. However, if it was intended to be entered it is DENIED entry. The changes are far too numerous to consider after prosecution on the merits has be closed.



Robert Beatty
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2852